

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 26 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Number 6,173,155 issued to Norin on January 9, 2001.

Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1 recites,

"receiving the signal;

separating the signal into groups of messages having frequency bands with the same bandwidth, all messages in any group occupy non-adjacent frequency bands;

combining the messages of each group;

applying each combined group of messages to a separate amplifier to amplify each combined group of messages; and

separating each amplified group of messages into separate messages."

Norin does not teach this limitation. Instead, Norin discloses a technique for reducing the number of amplifiers in a satellite system by amplifying two or more lower power channels by the same common amplifier. The channels are selected if their frequency bands are mutually discrete and sufficiently separated in frequency that their third order intermodulation products do not substantially overlap in frequency with any of the other channels to be amplified by the same amplifier, as stated in column 3, lines 50-58. However, contrary to applicant's claim 1, Norin does not disclose "separating the signal into groups of messages having frequency bands with the same bandwidth", as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Norin is that the signal is not separated into groups of messages having frequency bands with the same bandwidth.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that Norin does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Norin. Since claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1, this claim is also allowable over Norin.

Best Available Copy

Independent claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11 each has a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Norin. For example, claim 3 recites, "separating the messages into groups of messages having the same bandwidth", and claim 4 recites "separating the signal into groups of messages having frequency bands with the same bandwidth", and claim 6 recites "at the relaying station separating the messages into groups of messages having the same bandwidth", and claims 7 and 11 recite "a filter unit to filter and group the separated messages into groups of messages having the same bandwidth". Norin does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11 are likewise allowable over Norin. Since claim 5 depends from claim 4, claims 8-10 depend from claim 7, and claims 12-13 depend from claim 11, these claims are also allowable over Norin.

Best Available Copy

10

NGC-259/22-0153

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Respectfully submitted;



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,784

FEB 26 2007

Dated: February 26, 2007

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Customer Number 32205

Best Available Copy